UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,218	03/24/2004	Kazuya Ueda	1324.70174	3929
Patrick G. Burn	7590 11/07/200 s, Esq.	EXAMINER		
GREER, BURN	S & CRAIN, LTD.	CHEN, WEN YING PATTY		
Suite 2500 300 South Wacl	ker Drive	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Chicago, IL 606	506	2871		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/808,218	UEDA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
WEN-YING PATTY CHEN	2871	

	WEN-YING PATTY CHEN	28/1	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav al (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (iii)	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	•	190/a) and the appropriat	a automoian faa
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	timely filed amendmen	at canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii subifiilled iii a separale,	unlery filed afficilities	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 4 and 29.		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected io. <u>4 and 23</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5-10,12,13,15,27,28 and 30-39</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	before or on the date of filing a N	ation of Annual will no	be entered
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/David Nalms/			
/David Nelms/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2871			
,			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed on Oct. 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Sawasaki (US 2003/0043326) does not qualify as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. 103 because Sawasaki and the present application were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same entity. However, since Sawasaki was published on Mar. 6, 2003, which is at least one year from the filing date of the present invention, Sawasaki qualifies as a 102(b) reference. Hence, the statement of commonly assignment is moot and cannot overcome the rejections under Sawasaki.

Applicants further argue that Park (US 6466280) failed to disclose that the at least one low effective voltage area and the another area are formed by applying a voltage between a same pair of electrodes. The argument is not found persuasive because in Figure 5D of Park, elements 70 and 68 both combined are considered as the pixel electrode since they are being applied with the same voltage. The claim does not require that the pixel electrode to be of a single layer structure nor the specific structures of the at least one effective voltage area and the another area. Therefore, giving the broadest and reasonable interpretation of the claim, Park and Kubo (US 6452654) combined are believed to disclose all of the limitations of claim 6, thus the rejections are maintained..